

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "Warren E. Lewis" <saswel@unx.sas.com>
Subject: [1361] "Knightlites Net" aka 80M QRP Net
Message-ID: <199512141834.AA12917@cardamom.unx.sas.com>

Gang,

The 80M QRP Net Saga continues on Sunday December 17, 1995
at 10PM EST on 3560 with AD4ZE as Net Control.

I know a few of you have expressed concern over the choice
of frequency. Most likely in the future we will be moving
the frequency to the 80M Novice Subband to encourage participation
of all license classes. We will monitor the area around 3710
this week to see if there is a good spot to hold future nets.

I look forward to putting all of you in this weeks net log.

cheers and 73 - Warren

--

Warren E. Lewis	saswel@unx.sas.com
Technical Support Division	(919) 677-8001 x6542
SAS Institute Inc.	PP-ASEL
Cary, NC	AD4ZE QRP-L#78 DOD#0021

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Nick Franco <kf2ph@bnl.gov>
Subject: [1367] 80 Meter Net Freq.
Message-ID: <9512141932.AA05321@bnlux1.bnl.gov.bnl.gov>

All the Pixie2's I built or helped my scouts build have a switch for two
crystals. I was able to obtain several 3.6864... crystals from old computer
boards and naturally the 3.579... crystals from the color burst modules and
some computer boards. Point: if 3.686 is a available crystal, then a simple
switch and additional crystal modification to your Pixie2 could allow
everyone to participate in the Novice portion of 80 Meters. Is this
workable. Maybe I can make another visit to the computer grave yard on site
here and scavenge up some 3.686 cyrstals for those who need them. Just a
thought!

PS: On my Pixie2 I also have a var. cap and inductor to bend each crystal a
little. Helps when someone Zero's on you or for QRM.

72 es Happy Holidays,
Nick - KF2PH

Nicholas J. Franco	\\	Brookhaven National Laboratory
Sr. Systems Specialist	____	Building 1005 Room 201
Tel: (516) 344-5467	_ /__ / \\ /	UPTON, N.Y. 11973-5000
Fax: (516) 344-3674	_ /QRP-L#13_ /	
Email: kf2ph@bnl.gov	/___/___/	Ham Call: KF2PH NE-QRP#349

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
 From: LVE1@inel.gov (Larry East)
 Subject: [1344] A few comments...
 Message-ID: <9512141551.AA29782@garnet.inel.gov>

I subscribe to this list (actually, the summary) because I find occasional tidbits of useful information -- rig mods, technical tips, QRP kit reviews, etc. However, I find it more than just a little annoying having to scan thru many pages of "junk mail" to find the occasional useful item. I'm not really complaining about the FOX hunt items -- although some of you DO get carried away with all the minute details -- but all the items about what is/isn't "home brew", search for a mascot (for a news list?? come on...), run-ins with local MVDs and "Fat Burger" shops, quotes from Ogden Nash, etc. I can do without!!

Keeping messages short and to the point would also be greatly appreciated! It takes me about 30 minutes just to page thru all the "crap" every morning (unlike some folkes, I'm expected to produce some useful output each day -- measured in lines of computer code and/or documentation). And please, PLEASE **PLEASE** don't include the COMPLETE original text in your one-line response to a previous post!!

If you feel the need to show off your literary capabilities, then write up something and send it to a journal! If its really good, send it to the QRP Quarterly; if its not, send it to someone else...

72, Larry W1HUE/7

PS -- Send all flames to junk@bitbucket.net

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Charles Cashion <ccashion@spdmail.spd.dsccc.com>
Subject: [1309] Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <199512140322.AA29888@aplo1.spd.dsccc.com>

QRP'ers,

The latest issue of QST came today. The item that pique'd my attention was an "automagic antenna tuner". I do not have an antenna tuner, so any antenna tuner would catch my attention. And it is a construction article! OH BOY! I love construction articles. Then I examine it more closely.

The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement. The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here before? ...I think so.

Three things I do not like. First I do not like being the brunt of a joke. Second, I do not like "bait-and-switch" tactics. Third...I do not like mis-understandings. Even when my own thought process plays a part in it.

OBQRP: A friend has loaned me a receiver, and I have discovered W1AW in the evenings on 40m. Great way to practice code. It even comes with built-in QRM and fade and interference (an all that other good stuff).

OB-OB-QRP: I have put all the resistors on the Explorer II. I have almost put all the capacitors on the board.

73, Charles Cashion, ex-W5ISZ

--
+ - - - - - +
| Charles Cashion w.214-519-2583 h.214-881-0952 |
| ARRL NorTex#116 NorCal#1320 ex-W5ISZ QRP-L#76 |
+ - - - - - +

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: PAT DOYLE <DOYLEPS@LAKEHURST.NAVY.MIL>
Subject: [1331] Antenna Tuner -Reply
Message-ID: <s0cfe63d.049@LAKEHURST.NAVY.MIL>

Regarding the auto-tuner in this month's QST: I do not believe that it is a commercial advertisement. If I remember correctly, the guys are engineers for Naval aircraft systems, not a commercial enterprise. They would have been doing in addition to their "day job." Berating the

authors charging for a design and assembling the required parts and all in kit form for those interested seems a bit silly and anti-productive.

I believe that the price for the programmed microprocessor alone was \$35. I would hardly say that is unreasonable. Many of the memory keyer kits plans available require programmed EEPROMs for more than that.

If you are not so inclined to build it from junk parts, \$150 is not that bad for an auto-tuner kit.

If you don't like the idea, don't buy it.

>>> Charles Cashion
<ccashion@spdmail.spd.dsccc.com> 12/13/95 10:24pm
>>>

QRP'ers,

The latest issue of QST came today. The item that pique'd my attention was an "automagic antenna tuner". I do not have an antenna tuner, so any antenna tuner would catch my attention. And it is a construction article!

OH BOY! I love construction articles. Then I examine it more closely.

The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.

The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here before? ...I think so.

Three things I do not like. First I do not like being the brunt of a joke.

Second, I do not like "bait-and-switch" tactics.

Third...I do not like mis-understandings. Even when my own thought process plays a part in it.

OBQRP: A friend has loaned me a receiver, and I have discovered W1AW in the evenings on 40m. Great way to practice code. It even comes with built-in QRM and fade and interference (an all that other good stuff).

OB-OB-QRP: I have put all the resistors on the Explorer II. I have almost put all the capacitors

on the board.

73, Charles Cashion, ex-W5ISZ

--

```
+ - - - - -  
- +  
| Charles Cashion    w.214-519-2583  
h.214-881-0952 |  
| ARRL  NorTex#116  NorCal#1320  ex-W5ISZ  
QRP-L#76 |  
+ - - - - -  
- +
```

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995

From: PAT DOYLE <DOYLEPS@LAKEHURST.NAVY.MIL>

Subject: [1334] Antenna Tuner -Reply

Message-ID: <s0cfe5da.047@LAKEHURST.NAVY.MIL>

Regarding the auto-tuner in this month's QST: I do not believe that it is a commercial advertisement. If I remember correctly, the guys are engineers for Naval aircraft systems, not a commercial enterprise. They would have been doing in addition to their "day job." Berating the authors charging for a design and assembling the required parts and all in kit form for those interested seems a bit silly and anti-productive.

I believe that the price for the programmed microprocessor alone was \$35. I would hardly say that is unreasonable. Many of the memory keyer kits plans available require programmed EEPROMs for more than that.

If you are not so inclined to build it from junk parts, \$150 is not that bad for an auto-tuner kit.

If you don't like the idea, don't buy it.

>>> Charles Cashion

<ccashion@spdmail.spd.dsccc.com> 12/13/95 10:24pm

>>>

QRP'ers,

The latest issue of QST came today. The item that pique'd my attention was an "automagic antenna tuner". I do not have an antenna tuner, so any antenna tuner would catch my attention. And it is a construction article!

OH BOY! I love construction articles. Then I examine it more closely.

The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.

The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here before? ...I think so.

Three things I do not like. First I do not like being the brunt of a joke.

Second, I do not like "bait-and-switch" tactics.

Third...I do not like mis-understandings. Even when my own thought process plays a part in it.

OBQRP: A friend has loaned me a receiver, and I have discovered W1AW in the evenings on 40m. Great way to practice code. It even comes with built-in QRM and fade and interference (an all that other good stuff).

OB-OB-QRP: I have put all the resistors on the Explorer II. I have almost put all the capacitors on the board.

73, Charles Cashion, ex-W5ISZ

--

+ - - - - -

- +

| Charles Cashion w.214-519-2583

h.214-881-0952 |

| ARRL NorTex#116 NorCal#1320 ex-W5ISZ

QRP-L#76 |

+ - - - - -

- +

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Clark Savage Turner WA3JPG <turner@safety.ICS.UCI.EDU>
Subject: [1317] Argonaut 515 low sens. on 80?
Message-ID: <23836.818920133@safety.ics.uci.edu>

Anyone a Ten Tec Argonaut 505 / 509 / 515 fan out there? I finally found a 515 and it is in good shape, but nearly deaf on 75 meters... only. It seems to be fine everywhere else. The peak on the preselector seems to be fairly sharp, but I suppose that says little? Ideas? I tried the receiver trimmer on 75, and it is fine. The only other thing I can think of is the preselector rack with its inductors, maybe the lower range is misaligned? I haven't aligned the preselector before, and just wanted to check with others before I call Ten Tec for their thoughts.

Clark
WA3JPG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Raymond Sommers <rsommers@worf.uwsp.edu>
Subject: [1319] ASCII fox pictures from WWW
Message-ID: <Pine.BSI.3.91.951214012716.17207A-100000@worf.uwsp.edu>

HARD TO CATCH HIM

```
  |\\|
  .--.. \ /\\ /
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
  /_ /_ /_ /_ /
```

```
  |\\|
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
```

```
  |\\|
  .--.. \ /\\ /
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
  /_ /_ /_ /_ /
```

```
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
  \_ /_ /_ /_ /
```

```

  \ /  \ /  . . .
  \_  \_  \_
  \_  \_  \_

```

```

  | \ / |  / \ /
. . . \_  \_  \_
  \_  \_  \_
  / \ / \_  \_

```

```

  \_  \_  | \ / |
  \_  \_  \_  \_
  \_  \_  \_  \_
  \_  \_  \_  \_

```

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
 From: Jeff Gold <JMG@tntech.edu>
 Subject: [1339] Cascade-the fun continues
 Message-ID: <01HYSJ6IJENC99DK7R@tntech.edu>

well after completing the first four sections of the Cascade I have definetly identified what is to me the main overwhelming problem with the instructions. I had noticed that in a few kits I made some mistakes, well while working on the Cascade yesterday I identified and corrected the problem.

The first indication was when after what I thought was very carefully building the audio amp section and firing it up.. the audio amp seemed to work, but the PTT didn't mute the receiver. Well I did remember to put in the extra parts.. so went and immediately looked at the transistor with my magnifying glass. I noticed that I had put the transistor in rotated one leg off. This was a new one for me.. never done that before.. and I was carefull when I put it in. I noticed that using the magnifying glass I had no problem, but then looked at it without the magnifying glass. Things were a bit blurry.

I went to the kitchen and retrieved my reading glasses (the kind you can get without a prescription from the drug store). The kind that us old fold need as our lenses get harder with old age. Yes the kind you must use when your arms are no longer long enough to put that book out at a distance where the words can be done. Well, yes I am saying the major problem I had with the Cascade directions is a psychological problem. I have always had very good eyesight and made it to 45 without wearing glasses.. and still can

read and all without them.. as long as there is enough light or my arms can hold the book far enough away.

Well anyway, put on my glasses and noted that I could easily identify the parts and see the silk screening on the board. What a big improvement.. think I might just wear them while building from now on :-)

I have not had any problems up through section 4 with any directions. Basically all I did was use Dougs errata and note the changes in the manual. As a matter of fact I find the majority of the instructions quite easy to follow.

If you have been holding off.. suggest you just make the changes and another tip is to read the section after each listing of parts. the narrative quite often explains away the majority of confusion that might arise while building.

I find that this is one of the most enjoyable kits I have ever built. I love building the section and then getting to test and align it.. it has saved my neck. I have made at least one minor error in each section that have been easy for me to find and correct (yes even with my limited knowledge of those silly electrons).. sure is easier than trying to find the problem when the whole thing is done.

Another note. I like plated thru boards.. The only problem with most of them is if you have to remove a component. I have found with the Cascade board that if I use a solder sucker and then some solder wick, I can get the component out without ruining the board with a lot less difficulty than any other board I have soldered.

I think with a minimal amount of effort this will make a top of the line commercial kit and hope Wilderness or someone else decides to produce it eventually.

thanks a million guys at Norcal

73,72 and still counting
Jeff, AC4HF

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: dh@deneb.csustan.edu (Doug Hendricks)
Subject: [1314] December QRPP
Message-ID: <9512140416.AA00877@deneb.csustan.edu>

Gentlemen start your engines (and new Extra Paulette, Congrats), the December issue of QRPP was sent to the printer on Oct. 31. I received all of the copies last Thursday, and I got the labels attached and the Plastic envelopes sealed Saturday and Sunday. They were taken to the Post Office on Monday. They are on the way, and I hope you enjoy it. There is information on page 66 on how to order a St. Louis Tuner and also an announcement that there are 50 more Cascades available. Please don't email me and ask for information. As editor I think that I must not give that information out on the net until the subscribers have had a chance to get the info. Of course I have no control if someone else posts the information when they get their copy. 72,Doug

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: bmitchel@kodak.com (Brad Mitchell)
Subject: [1335] for sale 9030 mfj qrp
Message-ID: <9512141428.AA13098@iiatasun.cba.Kodak.COM>

Well, I traded for this thing, and now it's for sale. 30 meter qrp.

\$100 in like new condition, original box etc.

abt 3.5 to 4 w out..
QSK.. as advertised IE: not really
750 Hz filter .
good enuf for 30 meters.
No options.
nice speaker built in..
rit.
etc.
regards, Brad WB8YGG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM (Pete Rossi)
Subject: [1368] FOR SALE : OHR CLASSIC dual band transceiver
Message-ID: <9512141940.AA13143@gvlf6-a>

OHR "CLASSIC" 20/40 DUAL-BAND CW TRANSCEIVER with/ optional OHR KEYS

- = Fully assembled, aligned. Works perfectly.
- = 7.000-7.100 and 14.000-14.100 coverage
(can be modified for 7.100-7.150 novice coverage)
- = Superhet receiver with RIT, agc, crystal + audio filters

- = 0-5 watts output : QSK : sidetone
- = includes optional OHR keyer
- = runs from 12-14 V
- = With all original documentation

Original cost (w/keyer) \$260 in *kit* form.

Own one of the nicest CW QRP rigs around without having to build it.

Ready to go for \$210 + COD shipping.

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA
rossi@vfl.paramax.com
Loral Defense Systems-Eagan (formerly Unisys Government Systems Group)
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: BRUCE3900@delphi.com
Subject: [1311] FOUR DAYS IN MAY (c) -- A REMINDER
Message-ID: <01HYRXJFGIEQ9853DQ@delphi.com>

December 13, 1995

The Time is Near

Hey Gang,

The time is getting shorter every day for you to get going on the paper you're going to write and give for the greatest QRP show of 1996, "Four Days in May (c)".

You remember "Four Days in May (c)", the extra day of QRP fun and frolic we tacked on to the usual three days of the Dayton Hamvention? It will be a day to remember. Seminars of inside QRP information made up from written by QRPers like yourselves, for QRPers like yourselves.

I already have a number of invited papers lined up on our core topics, antennas, QRP operation, and equipment construction. What's missing are your papers. Surely there's something QRP related that you'd like to share with your fellow QRPers, isn't there? How about getting off your you know what and writing a paper about it for the group. The only real criteria for acceptance of a paper is that the topic be interesting to other

QRPers and that you be able to deliver camera ready copy in time for publication prior to the event.

I published the following guide to topics for papers:

Antennas -- Papers describing practical, working antennas suitable for camping or backpacking, or hidden antennas suitable for use from apartments and condominiums. Of course antenna designs that offer above average performance at QRP power levels are always in demand.

Equipment Construction -- QRPers are avid builders. Papers covering "selection of a first project" and "testing, and troubleshooting finished projects". But, product reviews are not acceptable. Stick to how and why you chose it and the problems you had putting it together and getting it running. Stay away from the rare dx stations you worked on the dummy load before you finished the check-out.

Manufacturers can submit papers for these seminars, BUT they cannot take the form of advertising. That is you can talk about design techniques and performance characteristics of certain circuits as compared to others, but NO "my superwhizbang 5 is better than all the rest papers" because they won't make the cut.

Actually, a topic I left out the first time around is older QRP gear -- gear from the 50's and 60's like the "sandwich box transmitters" and the "one tube wonders". Fertile ground here if you've kept everything you ever built, like I have!

Operating Activities -- Papers describing operation away from the home QTH, whether it was a camping trip, a DXpedition, or just an afternoon at the local park are welcome. Papers that describe special QRP operating techniques you've developed that have helped you win awards, or contests, or just make more QRP QSOs are welcome. Papers on the history of QRP operating, and QRP operation during sunspot cycle highs and lows would also be interesting, as would papers on QRP operation at VHF or UHF, or using satellites.

All accepted papers are going to be reprinted and distributed to the conference attendees. We may also publish a bound volume of papers after the conference is over.

If you'd like to submit a paper, please send me a summary of your proposed paper before January 30, 1996. The summary should not longer than one double-spaced typewritten page. I

want a;; summaries by US Mail so I don't lose them in my lousy file system. I'll let you know before February 1, 1996 if your paper was selected.

Plan your paper for a 20 to 25 minute talk followed by a 5 to 10 minute question and answer session. I understand that some topics will talk longer and generate more questions. While you will be responsible for providing your own camera ready copy and your own illustrations for both the paper and the talk, don't let this worry you too much. I'll help you get ready as much as I can. You'll have until March 15, 1996 to prepare camera ready copy.

Don't "wuss out" on this. Don't let others do it for you. Much as we all like Chuck, and the Reverend Dobbs, and a few others, don't you secretly believe you can do at least as well on your pet subject? I know I do. Get going, start thinking about what you've done and what you'd like to share. While you must send your summary by "snail mail", I'll answer questions and give advice via email.

Please send summaries to:
Bruce Muscolino -- W6TOY/3
PO Box 9333
Silver Spring, MD 20916-9333

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: paul1@wizard.ucs.sfu.ca (Paul Erickson)
Subject: [1381] Fox help
Message-ID: <9512150052.AA15083@wizard.ucs.sfu.ca>

Sorry, I lost the fox schedule for tonight, can someone help?

cheers, Paul
VE7CQK
email: paul1@wizard.ucs.sfu.ca

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: bmitchel@kodak.com (Brad Mitchell)
Subject: [1323] Fox Sched?

Message-ID: <9512141242.AA12322@iiatasun.cba.Kodak.COM>

Ok, not that I'll actually find time to operate, much less find the fox, but what's the schedule?

Is there a Fox Faq ???

Cool pic, isn't it amazing we're still doing
ascii graphics after all these years...

```

  |\\|
.---.. \ / \ /
 \_ / \_ / \_ /
  /_ /_ /_ /_ /
 /---/---/

```

73 Brad WB8YGGG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: H Smith <hbs@crl.com>
Subject: [1328] FOX SCHEDULE CHANGE FOR 12/19/95
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951214052141.16950A-100000@crl7.crl.com>

**** NOTICE OF FOX SCHEDULE CHANGE FOR TUESDAY 12/19/95 ****

Schedule is changed as follows:

Tuesday December 19,1995 --- NA5K Smitty

9:00 - 9:30 PM CST
3:00 - 3:30 AM UTC 7.040 +/-

9:30 - 10:00 PM CST
3:30 - 4:00 AM UTC 7.110 +/-

10:00 - 11:00 PM CST
4:00 - 5:00 AM UTC 7.040 +/-

These times are one hour later than previously scheduled.

CU on Tuesday,

Smitty, NA5K

Henry Smith (hbs@crl.com)

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "David R. Slade" <dslade@lightlink.com>
Subject: [1348] Foxes
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951214114138.12106A-100000@light.lightlink.com>

I would also like to see some more advanced notice on the
Fox nights and times. My digest arrives a day late, and I don't
read it till usually the morning after the hunt.....a day
late and a \$\$ short again...hi

Happy Holidays to all on the list....
73 de Dave K2SJB

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: william.redfearn.cmwd101@nt.com
Subject: [1387] FS: OHR-400 & misc.
Message-ID: <"4406 Thu Dec 14 20:41:41 1995"@nt.com>

For Sale:

OHR-400 unbuilt kit
box has been opened but not unpacked.
If you missed the group buy, here's your chance.
\$256.00 + shipping.

MFJ - 4112 portable power pack
battery holder and power supply for the MFJ-90XX radios.
excellent condition with manual & box.
\$30.00 + shipping.

GLB TNC-2
TNC-2 clone for VHF packet.
good condition with manuals.

Palomar Noise Bridge

works fine, paint flaked off in a couple of places.
with box and manual.
\$30.00 + shipping.

Ten-Tec 220 filter
2.4 Khz wide, 9 Mhz IF crystal filter.
\$30.00 + shipping.

73 - Dave.

=====
Dave Redfearn, Sr RF Systems Engineer NORTEL RTP, NC.
ph.(919) 992-3925 email: william.redfearn.cmwdtr01@nt.com
qrl? de N4ELM/qrp

All opinions are my own, no one else wants them.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: BWHITTEM@mailgw.sanders.lockheed.com
Subject: [1325] i am qrp
Message-ID: <0d023cf0@mailgw.sanders.lockheed.com>

well i got my first copy of 72 and my first qrp qsl card in
the mail yesterday. i am neqrp #431 and qrp-1 #51
barry
wb1edi 1.5w es indoor dipole.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "Doyle, Ron" <doyler@uh2297p01.daytonoh.attgis.com>
Subject: [1324] Making condenser from scratch
Message-ID: <30D01D8B@sdcwinn.daytonoh.attgis.com>

I told Rick, ve6gk, I would try to find some info on this from an old Cub Scout Book that I had and thought the list might be interested in what I found. This has got to be the definitive source for making condensers. It's from the Wolf cub scout book, USA copyright 1954.

The condenser is 1 inch by 1 1/4 inches. All pieces should be cut to something pretty close. My guess is that it's not real critical but should be close.

It's made of the following layers:

Cardboard
copper strip
tin foil
cellophane
tin foil
cellophane
tin foil
cellophane
copper strip
cardboard

The copper strips stick out on opposite ends enough for wires to be connected to. I would think that Seran Wrap would work for the cellophane but I don't know this for sure.

The condenser description was included in the plans for a crystal radio. This plan calls for a coil about 2 1/2 inches in diameter and 6 to 7 inches long. The detector was a Galena rock placed in a copper tube just tall enough to hold the rock. The rock is held in place by a screw going through the tube and against the rock. A safety pin was used to find the 'sweet spot' of the rock. Tuning was done with a brass wiper on the coil. This is probably not enough details to make a radio but hopefully enough to get the flavor of the what the radio was made of.

I assume the razor blade detector could also be used in place of the rock.

Before anyone thinks that I am 'that old', based on the copyright of this book, I must tell you that this is my brother's book, (Don, Kc5eqc). Sorry Don, but I couldn't let everyone think that I was that old.:) Ok, the real story is that the book was printed in 1962 and Don and I are twins so you can make you own conclusions from that.

72, es 73 to all and good fox hunting tonight.

Ron Doyle, N8VAR qrp-1# 263
AT&T GIS - Dayton
Work (513) 445-3179
Home (513) 237-0790
<Ronald.Doyle@DaytonOH.ATTGIS.COM>

Practice Random Kindness and Senseless Acts of Beauty

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: scalawag@ids.net
Subject: [1336] Mascot
Message-ID: <199512141451.JAA63580@nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU>

Gang,

Hank, K8DD, and others have mentioned wanting to see pictures of the Snipe, proposed mascot of our group.

Here is a picture of the Fox (somewhat different from the ASCII pictures recently posted here) which I have managed to hear twice this season but unable to work.....

Now here is a picture of the Snipe which I have actually caught once or twice in my younger days.....

Notice the uncanny resemblance! It would make a perfect logo for this gang on our ballcaps, sweatshirts, stationery, etc. For those of you unable to decode the above pictures due to lack of software, etc. you may e-mail me direct for 8 x 10 color glossys, for a modest price.

72, Lee W5TEH

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Mike White <mpw@chensys.com>
Subject: [1343] Mascot
Message-ID: <9512141530.AA28929@puma.chensys.com>

Hmmm. I'd vote for the ferret...

But, Mighty Mouse might be a good one, too. (probably TM'ed to death.)
--

"Remember to tell your kids about the days when USENET was store and forward." -- Jim Thompson

Netscape - the Turbo C of the browser world.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Nick Franco <kf2ph@bnl.gov>
Subject: [1345] Mascot - I'm Sold
Message-ID: <9512141557.AA27822@bnlux1.bnl.gov.bnl.gov>

Well, I wasn't going to make a comment but... I like the fox thing. Even though it's been like a snipe hunt for me too, I really like the fox logo and the ascii pic also. So look at my sig file. Seems as good a place as any to post the qrp-1 number. If there are objections to using this, let me know. I didn't receive permission from the originator. I just wanted you all to see as an example.

Nick

```

... .  .-  .-. .-.-  .--  ....  -.-  .-  .--  ....-  . .
Nicholas J. Franco      |\\|      _____ Brookhaven National Laboratory
Sr. Systems Specialist ._. . \   /\   / Building 1005      Room 201
Tel: (516) 344-5467     \_   /__ / \ / UPTON, N.Y.      11973-5000
Fax: (516) 344-3674     _/QRP-L#13_/
Email: kf2ph@bnl.gov    /___/____/      Ham Call: KF2PH      NE-QRP#349
```

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Scott Rosenfeld NF3I <ham@w3eax.umd.edu>
Subject: [1333] Need Tejas Backpacker II Manual!
Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9512140949.B629-01000000@w3eax.umd.edu>

KD1TS has just sent me a partially-built Tejas RF Technology Backpacker II QRP xcvr. Nice aluminum case, seems pretty well-made. Model TRFT-550. Anyway, he can't find the manual, and the radio is only partially built.

HELP! I would like to bring this beast to life.

Scott Rosenfeld NF3I Burtonsville, MD FM19 QRV 40-10/6/2/440
** Yes, you CAN do VHF contests with 25W and omni antennas **
Still stuck at 138 countries confirmed on HF w/dipoles...

72 & 73 from lovely suburban DC 301-549-1022 weekends/evenings

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Bob_Tellefsen-CNSE97@email.mot.com
Subject: [1351] No Wednesday Digest Received
Message-ID: <M590911.001.169o0.1.951214170811Z.CC-MAIL*/OU=LMPCC10/OU=ILBB/
PRMD=MOT/ADMD=MOT/C=US/@MHS>

This is being written Thursday morning.
Haven't received yesterday's digest.

Listened for the fox last night with no luck. Didn't hear anyone else working
him either.

Funny thing is, I worked Florida, West Virginia and Nebraska, so I know the band
was working, sort of.

72

BobT N6WG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: LVE1@inel.gov (Larry East)
Subject: [1341] NorCal 40A Question
Message-ID: <9512141529.AA29328@garnet.inel.gov>

Is it normal to have to run the audio gain almost wide open? Not
complaining, just wondering... sensitivity seems good, and am now getting
AGC action after replacing the 2N4416 FETs with a matched pair of J309's.
However, it seems to me that the audio output is rather low; want to make
sure I haven't screwed something up. I'm using a pair of "middle of the
road" (about \$20 -- got 'em at Wall Mart, I think) stereo phones that work
well with all my other rigs.

72, Larry W1HUE/7
LVE1@inel.gov

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "Stan Goldstein, N6ULU" <stan@cruzio.com>
Subject: [1384] Norcal40 output filter
Message-ID: <9512141705.aa06429@inside.cruzio.com>

Gang, we measured my harmonic output on my '40 and found it to be just a tad "illegal" . I think 2f was 28 db down on the first harmonic and 30 is required for a rig with 5 watts or less.

Here is some interesting stuff on the output filter of the norcal 40.

After the fox hunt Monday night (nhtf or anybody calling), I pulled L7 out and measured it with my trusty Autek RF Analyst and found it to be higher than expected.

Consulting the charts , 18 turns on a t37-2 was supposed to be 1.3 uh, I measured close to 2. I removed a turn and remeasured and got close to 1.7, still too high, but popped it back into the rig to see the results.

I don't have a spectrum analyzer here , so i measured the harmonics by looking at the s-meter on my commercial rig.

I also measured the output power with a scope and a dummyload.

S-Meter Readings

	base reading	new readings
	(before changes)	(after change)

freq	s9	s10+
2x freq	s7	s6.7
3x freq	s3.5	s3

Output power

42 volts p-p	45 volts p-p
(calculated 4.34 watts)	(calculated 4.96 watts)

(Dummy load measured 51 ohms)

Is this "normal" for a toroid to be 50 % out of tolerance ?

May play with L8 tomorrow and see what happens there.

Hope to get to a spectrum analyzer to verify my results.

72/3 , Stan N6ULU.

STAN@CRUZIO.COM

--

Stan Goldstein

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: paul1@wizard.ucsf.edu (Paul Erickson)
Subject: [1386] Offers for HW-8
Message-ID: <9512150242.AA15988@wizard.ucsf.edu>

I have just become owner of a qrp+ and ohr 400 kit, which means for the right price or swap deal I would be willing to part with my hw-8. Rit and two additional poles of audio filtering have been added. Jacks on the back for external frequency counter and two 2.5mm power jacks for accessories. I used them for the freq counter and a scf filter.

Make me an offer I can't refuse.

cheers, Paul
VE7CQK
email: paul1@wizard.ucsf.edu

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "BOB SCHNICK, KA3YJG" <schnick@shrsys.hslc.org>
Subject: [1365] Opinions wanted: Argonaut II
Message-ID: <0099ADB7.7C4A1E71.76@shrsys.hslc.org>

Please E-Mail off the list, E-Mail Schnick@shrsys.Hslc.org

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Gene Tehansky <tehansky@atc.ameritel.net>
Subject: [1385] Possible provider loss
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.3.91.951214210318.968C-100000@atc.ameritel.net>

Well, things get going good and I get an email about my provider maby going under. Living in the boondocks it may be hard to find another. Now that is qrp, no power qrp...

de aa3av Gene

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Duane Anderson <dandersn@ix.netcom.com>
Subject: [1315] QRP MASCOT
Message-ID: <199512140508.VAA13928@ix4.ix.netcom.com>

I think we should adopt the Mongoose as the mascot. He is very tenacious and gregarious toward his goals and desires especially regarding going after the cobra (we could liken the cobra to the QRO operator). He jumps on his prey and doesn't let go for anything.
We need to be known for our stick-to-it attitudes when working QRP.

72,
Duane, KJ7HO
QRP-L #164
ARCI #9033

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Jim Hunter <jhunter@sunrise.alpinet.net>
Subject: [1356] random wire ant.
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951214112551.17786A-100000@sunrise.alpinet.net>

Is there an optimum length for a random wire???

Minimum length for all hf bands??
Maximum length for qrp??

any suggestions would be greatly appreciated, I'm new to qrp

Thanks

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: RHILT0@acxiom.com
Subject: [1363] Re[2]: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <0d074590@acxiom.com>

Tom WB2QDG wrote --

>What's going on here, anyway. I thought I was being a bit over-sensitive,
>but I'm glad that Charles agrees with me...If QST doesn't think it has
>enough ads, let 'em sell more instead of disguising them as articles.

>Any other opinions?

Yup...

1. Why doesn't somebody politely ask for the flowchart? That way you could duplicate the functions using your own algorithms and burn your own chip. Shoot, you might even be able to write a more efficient program. Isn't this supposed to be a construction article? Or would you rather somebody did all the work for you?
2. The article clearly indicates that you don't need their on-board processor, but can attach the tuner to your pc; do that, then publish your program source code in QST as a follow-up article.
3. The tuner article was not, IMO, an advertisement disguised as a construction article; many, many construction articles require you to buy some specialized component -- or do you want National to release the masks for their ICs?
4. Oh, this is different... this is software, not hardware. Right. So did you complain when you assembled your pc from individual components that Phoenix should release the source code for their BIOS chips?
5. How many of you paid for antenna modelling software and didn't get the source code?

Happy Hanukkah y'all

Bob ki5ez

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: lhalliday@creo.bc.ca
Subject: [1376] Re[2]: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9511148189.AA818983540@mail.creo.bc.ca>

This whole discussion comes down to one of faith - at what level of complexity are you prepared to use a component as-is, rather than making it yourself. We're comfortable with using transistors. We're comfortable with ICs like the ubiquitous NE602 and MC1350P. But when talk turns to microcontrollers and things, it starts to crowd some peoples' comfort levels...

We must all find our own level on this. I personally have no problem with MMICs (even at HF) and packaged DBMs (some SL6440s arrived in the mail yesterday - and the local Mini-Circuits representatives know me). Putting most of a receiver on a chip (MC3362, SL6700, TDA7000) can be really handy. One of my current projects incorporates **two** micro-controllers. I programmed of them myself, and bought the other one pre-programmed.

Much of this depends on what I'm building - a radio to use in my shack can have more individual components than a portable gadget to take with me when I travel. The portable radio will lean more heavily on ICs, with more work done by Motorola and Plessey engineers (to pick a couple of names at random...), and less by me. The larger non-portable radio can elaborate circuits with individual components for optimum performance; the portable radio uses what performance it can get from available building blocks (albeit pretty good if you pick your chips carefully).

The pros use stuff like this to reduce parts counts, improve reliability and reduce hassle. So can we.

Laura Halliday VE7LDH	"C'est une femme mutine, assez
lhalliday@creo.bc.ca	elegante, grave et legere, ayant
ve7ldh@amsat.org	le sens du confort et du plaisir
	en tout." - C. Deneuve

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Kirkekirk@aol.com
Subject: [1310] RS 12 & QRP
Message-ID: <951213222126_53601529@emout04.mail.aol.com>

After I saw a few postings on the list about RS 12 I had to give it a try. I have never used the "sats" before so it was a learning experience for me.

After the first time I heard my signal from RS 12 I was hooked. I've worked many stations and some DX. The xmtr is an HW-9 (3 watts out) and the rcvr is a TS-130V. The xmt ant is a 40m ground mounted vert. (a wire running up a tree) with 4 buried radials. It does not take much to get into RS 12 and the early morning passes lack activity. I would like to work some fellow QRPers on the list. Give it a try.

Kirk
AA4YZ
Canton, Oh

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: ljones@why.net (ljones)
Subject: [1318] Story
Message-ID: <19951214055611401.AAB75@dal31.why.net>

Greetings Joe...

Nice story. Need stuff like that once in a while. Thanks for the chuckle.
Been there. Happy Holidays...
72/73

dee-it dee-it (Texas Accent)

Larry n5osg

Larry Jones N5OSG NorTex QRP-ARCI G-QRP NorCal MI-QRP NE-QRP
4028 Random Circle
Garland Tx 75043-3250

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: HARKINC@aol.com
Subject: [1374] tuner source code
Message-ID: <951214172300_54356939@mail06.mail.aol.com>

Looks like if the guys that designed the tuner would publish the source code, then everybody would be happy.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Mike Robinson <miker@cc.com>
Subject: [1375] Xmas in CA
Message-ID: <9512142312.AA04688@voder.nsc.com>

I'm planning my Xmas/Family/QRP trip to
the left coast.

I'm trying to decide what QRP gear to
carry and not take abuse from XYL.

I was going to take my OHR400 but it is
a little big. I've decided to take my
lowered Norcal 40, mini-qrp tuner (HOMEBREWED!)
and some 24ga insulated wire.

The dilemma is whether or not to take my
MFJ259 analyzer. The tuner is very hi-Q'd.
So hitting a good SWR is difficult without
the analyzer. But then the analyzer is
bigger than all the other gear put together.

How much damage might the final in the Norcal
40 take with a less than desirable SWR. I've
got a good heat sink on it. I'll probably
be running a random wire after some RG-58
with a good counterpoise.

```
=====
7.3 de Michael aa0ub          | QRP:
miker@cc.com                  | "UR HB 5W FB HR 72"
QRP-L #126 Norcal #857 CQC #180 |
=====
```

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: wmcshan@REX.RE.uokhsc.edu (Mike McShan)
Subject: [1349] Yaesu FT747 mods
Message-ID: <9512141650.AA05581@rex.re.uokhsc.edu>

Hi gang,

I have a Yaesu FT747GX transceiver which can easily be used for QRP CW
(just crank the drive down). However, the output for SSB cannot be varied;
there is a mic adjustment, but that doesn't really affect power output.

Yaesu marketed a version of this radio (I think that it was FT747) that was all QRP.

Does anyone know if my rig can easily be converted to QRP? Anybody have Yaesu's tech number? There is an ALC jack in back for connection to an optional amplifier; I wonder if applying -9 V (the specified limit) to this jack would reduce power.

Any thoughts would be appreciated.

72/73,

Mike

(I guess this indirectly casts my vote for mascot) :)

W.Michael McShan, Ph.D. |\\| Univ. of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
Res. Asst. Professor .___.. \ /\ / Dept. of Microbiology and Immunology
Tel: (405) 271-1202 _ /___/ \ 940 S.L. Young Blvd. BMSB 1053
Fax: (405) 271-3117 _/ _/ Oklahoma City, OK 73104
Home: (405) 478-7670 /___/___/QRP-L#300 Email: wmcshan@rex.re.uokhsc.edu
Ham Call: N5JKY

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Stan Skelton <sskelton@cln.etc.bc.ca>
Subject: [1369] Re: "Knightlites Net" aka 80M QRP Net
Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9512141125.A7014-01000000@sparky>

YES!!! lets get the 80 meter net into the novice subband so all us
"neophytes" can participate...

73's Stan...VE7SKT ***QRP-L # 34 ***

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: W3HMS@aol.com
Subject: [1388] Re: "Knightlites Net" aka 80M QRP Net
Message-ID: <951214215810_54638343@mail04.mail.aol.com>

Novice band freq seems FB to me. 73, John

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Johnson_Dan@AAC.COM
Subject: [1320] Re: "Making Sense of 40 Meters
Message-ID: <9512141039.22763.ab@SMROUTER.AAC.COM>

----- Forwarded with Changes -----

From: Johnson_Dan
From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: W3HMS@aol.com
Subject: [1389] Re: A few comments...
Message-ID: <951214215809_54638309@emout05.mail.aol.com>

Larry.....very good points! I like the "keep it short" . I have the time
being retired but not to waste on junk mail as you suggest. 72/73, John .

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: markem@primenet.com (Mark Monninger)
Subject: [1312] Re: antenna and tuner help
Message-ID: <199512140414.VAA03457@usr5.primenet.com>

At 05:57 PM 12/13/95 EST, Harvey Winters wrote:

>Hi Gang:

>

>I am building 102 foot centre fed antenna.I want to use
>450 ohm ladder line.No problem you say.

>

>Well this is my problem.How long or how short should this
>ladder line be?And I want to use a balanced tuner.

>

Simple...it should be long (or short) enough to reach from you antenna to
your tuner...

73.... Mark AA7TA

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: JCoote@aol.com
Subject: [1379] Re: antenna and tuner help
Message-ID: <951214190149_73118077@mail02.mail.aol.com>

In a message dated 95-12-13 17:58:35 EST, ve1hdw@fox.nstn.ca (Harvey Winters)

writes:

>I am building 102 foot centre fed antenna.I want to use
>450 ohm ladder line.No problem you say.
>Well this is my problem.How long or how short should this
>ladder line be?And I want to use a balanced tuner.

Read up on the G5RV antenna. I think you can use 300 ohm TV or 450 ohm "ladder" line but the length is somewhere in the 32-34 foot area. Remember that in the G5RV the antenna and feed length is critical. The length gives a relatively low impedance match on the ham bands which is near to 50 ohms so coax may be connected to the G5RV feeder and used without a tuner (or so they tell me).

People with crummy tuners like the G5RV because it's easy to match- these tuners dont have enough L/C in them to match a wide range of impedances/reactances found on center-fed zepps and longwires. This brings up good tuner design, you need enough inductance and capacitance. Your 350 pF caps are enough for 1-30 Mhz, the inductor should be 0-25 uH or so.

Rather than plug-in coils you might try a tapped coil with a rotary ceramic switch or a roller coil.

Keep in mind if you have a tuner, these lengths are not so critical. The antenna flattop and feeder may be longer. Get the antenna/feeder length which tunes on all 9 bands. There are many such lengths which will work on all bands without ever having to prune the antenna again. Let the tuner do the work.

>I have two 365 variable capacitors, 1 single and the other
>one is a dual section.What can I build with these for a tuner
>using homebrewed plug in coils to suit the above antenna?

If the plate spacing is OK on your caps, build a standard T-network tuner from ARRL or other books. The two caps are in series from the input to output connector. Where the caps join in the middle there is a coil from the connection to ground, thus the T shape. One ARRL variation of the standard T-tuner is called the SPC and uses a dual or split capacitor on the output side. Add a good current balun rated for the 1-30 Mhz range on the output for balanced antennas. Beware cheapie powdered iron toroid balun projects which won't cover the whole band.

73, Jay
WB6AAM

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: markem@primenet.com (Mark Monninger)
Subject: [1313] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <199512140421.VAA04723@usr5.primenet.com>

At 10:25 PM 12/13/95 EST, Charles Cashion wrote:

>...

> The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.

>The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the

>kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here

>before? ...I think so.

>...

Yes, and it's been beaten to death several times in several newsgroups and mailing lists. Give it a rest. If you don't like it, don't build it.

Complain to the ARRL but spare us the rant.

Thanks.

Mark AA7TA

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: bmitchel@kodak.com (Brad Mitchell)
Subject: [1322] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512141223.AA12208@iiatasun.cba.Kodak.COM>

Charles Cashion wrote:

The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.

The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here before? ...I think so.

=====

When the majority of people want kits, that's what we all get.
Sorry Charlie.

73 Brad WB8YGG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Stan Skelton <sskelton@cln.etc.bc.ca>
Subject: [1337] Re: Antenna Tuner

Message-ID: <Pine.3.89.9512140742.A9848-0100000@sparky>

Excuse me...please don't speak for me...I haven't seen it "beaten to death in several newsgroups" and it was a timely revelation to me (I haven't got QST yet) so let the man disseminate info on a maillist without the flames please!

TtFn....Stan T.M. VE7 SKT QRP-L #34

On Wed, 13 Dec 1995, Mark Monninger wrote:

> At 10:25 PM 12/13/95 EST, Charles Cashion wrote:

> >...

> > The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.

> >The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the

> >kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here

> >before? ...I think so.

> >...

> Yes, and it's been beaten to death several times in several newsgroups and

> mailing lists. Give it a rest. If you don't like it, don't build it.

> Complain to the ARRL but spare us the rant.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Mark AA7TA

>

>

>

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995

From: Gene Tehansky <tehansky@atc.ameritel.net>

Subject: [1342] Re: Antenna Tuner

Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.3.91.951214095726.15953C-100000@atc.ameritel.net>

On Wed, 13 Dec 1995, Charles Cashion wrote:

> QRP'ers,

> The latest issue of QST came today. The item that pique'd my attention

> was an "automagic antenna tuner". I do not have an antenna tuner, so any

> antenna tuner would catch my attention. And it is a construction article!

> OH BOY! I love construction articles. Then I examine it more closely.

>

> The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.

> The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the


```

> kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here
> before? ...I think so.
>
> Three things I do not like. First I do not like being the brunt of a joke.
> Second, I do not like "bait-and-switch" tactics. Third...I do not like
> mis-understandings. Even when my own thought process plays a part in it.
> >
> 73, Charles Cashion, ex-W5ISZ
> --
> + - - - - - +
> | Charles Cashion   w.214-519-2583   h.214-881-0952 |
> | ARRL   NorTex#116   NorCal#1320   ex-W5ISZ   QRP-L#76 |
> + - - - - - +
>
>

```

Wow, ouch! That hurt. I am a bit confused as to how this kit differs significantly from the average radio kit available and talked about here on the list. This tuner was basically one ham's idea and two ham's work. Right to what I think is the main point, when we originally tried to determine if this project was possible, we both said, definitely give out the source code. Well after many months of work on the part of one of the hams (not me) a workable program crammed into 512 BYTES was developed that worked. We don't want to fool ourselves into thinking we can compete against the likes of MFJ, we can't and this project is easily copied. If MFJ wants to build this tuner, they can, but we will not give them the source code to do it, that should delay them for at least 6 months. It is a simple, efficient L tuner. All it does is switch capacitors and inductors, it can't be a more simple project. The two big problems were getting the code in 512 bytes and getting RF out of places it should not be at 100 plus watts. At qrp levels, the second problem goes away. Is \$20.00us too much to ask for one part, for months of work by some industrious ham, for the time he didn't have to do other things.

This is a construction project that a person could do from scratch. You can program the 68hc11 yourself, we do, it is kind of fun. It is assembly language but it isn't a pc, it is simple. You don't need the pc board, this tuner can be hand wired, probably with no ill effects at qrp levels. The processor isn't even required, our first version of the board had switches and it was functional although our choice of toggle switches would be frustrating. Possibly a rotary switch configuration would work. If one desired, they could probably even use their pc and parallel port to drive this device, thus totally ignoring the 68hc11.

Just because you feel you don't want to attack this as a construction project, please don't bite off our heads. The article shows you a design for a tuner, it offers you a \$20.00us microprocessor chip as the heart of the project if you want it, it offers you a \$35.00us pc

board if you want it, and it offers you a complete kit, if you don't want to go through the hassle of finding the parts yourself. Other than our fear of doing all this for nothing by giving the source code to some big time manufacturer, I don't see how this differs from other kits.

Thanks for your time and I am deeply sorry if we offended you.

Sincerely,

Gene Tehansky AA3AV, still from beautiful Southern Maryland.

If desired, LDG Electronics can be reached at ldg@atc.ameritel.net and a web page is available at <http://www.ameritel.net/lusers/ldg>

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "N100Q Tom R. @ MR01 14-Dec-1995 1110" <randolph@est.ENET.dec.com>
Subject: [1346] re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512141615.AA02945@us4rmc.pko.dec.com>

> The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.
> The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the
> kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here
> before? ...I think so.

Yah, I took one look at the cover and thought, "Hmm, a real construction article or another microcontroller that you can only buy pre-programmed?"

It's getting ridiculous. QST has one of those in almost every issue. Nothing against microcontrollers, you can do some really nifty things with 'em. What do you do 5 years down the road, though, when you static-zap your controller chip, and the authors of the article aren't around anymore?

=====
Tom Randolph N100Q NE-QRP 419 QRP-L 87 ARRL randolph@est.enet.dec.com
=====

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "C. J. Hawley Jr." <hawley@aries.scs.uiuc.edu>
Subject: [1352] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <30D05BCD.3679@aries.scs.uiuc.edu>

Gene Tehansky wrote:

>
> On Wed, 13 Dec 1995, Charles Cashion wrote:snip
> > The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.
> > The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the
> > kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here
> > before? ...I think so.snip
> > 73, Charles Cashion, ex-W5ISZsnip
> Wow, ouch! That hurt. I am a bit confused as to how this kit differs
> significantly from the average radio kit available and talked about here
> on the list. This tuner was basically one ham's idea and two ham's
> work. Right to what I think is the main point, when we originally tried
> to determine if this project was possible, we both said, definitely give
> out the source code. Well after many months of work on the part of one
> of the hams (not me) a workable program crammed into 512 BYTES was
> developed that worked. We don't want to fool ourselves into thinking we
> can compete against the likes of MFJ, we can't and this project is easily
> copied. If MFJ wants to build this tuner, they can, but we will not give
> them the source code to do it, that should delay them for at least 6
> months. It is a simple, efficient L tuner. All it does is switch
> capacitors and inductors, it can't be a more simple project. The two big
> problems were getting the code in 512 bytes and getting RF out of places
> it should not be at 100 plus watts. At qrp levels, the second problem
> goes away. Is \$20.00us too much to ask for one part, for months of work
> by some industrious ham, for the time he didn't have to do other things.
>
> This is a construction project that a person could do from scratch. You
> can program the 68hc11 yourself, we do, it is kind of fun. It is
> assembly language but it isn't a pc, it is simple. You don't need the pc
> board, this tuner can be hand wired, probably with no ill effects at qrp
> levels. The processor isn't even required, our first version of the
> board had switches and it was functional although our choice of toggle
> switches would be frustrating. Possibly a rotary switch configuration
> would work. If one desired, they could probably even use their pc and
> parallel port to drive this device, thus totally ignoring the 68hc11.
>
> Just because you feel you don't want to attack this as a
> construction project, please don't bite off our heads. The article shows
> you a design for a tuner, it offers you a \$20.00us microprocessor chip as
> the heart of the project if you want it, it offers you a \$35.00us pc
> board if you want it, and it offers you a complete kit, if you don't want
> to go through the hassle of finding the parts yourself. Other than our
> fear of doing all this for nothing by giving the source code to some big
> time manufacturer, I don't see how this differs from other kits.
>
> Thanks for your time and I am deeply sorry if we offended you.
>
> Sincerely,
> Gene Tehansky AA3AV, still from beautiful Southern Maryland.

This is a nice reply. I can't help but think that you are very resonable in your thinking, and I can see that you are resonable on the price. However the problem is that we keep thinking that this is a hobby and everybody is in it to learn and share what we learn. However simple minded that is, it's how I and a lot of Hams feel. Maybe times are changing. Maybe QST is a profit oriented business like any other. My feeling is that we have other mags for that. I fully expect QST to publish a Ramsey kit article....or an article on how to dial the phone, order something from MFJ, and then finish building it when you get it. It just seems a step down from what I naively cling to as a higher standard for the good of the hobby. There was an article on SSTV a couple of years ago, clearly a profit making venture, but the fellow offered free software to anyone who built the I/O card and sent along a picture as proof. I wired the thing up just for the experience (I'm not interested in SSTV) with Radio Shack parts and he sent the program. I tried it out a few times (still am not interested in SSTV)and it worked great. I talked it up on the air and maybe others got interested. Maybe it did his venture some good. I felt like he was including me in the process and the art of electronics. I don't suggest that you should give away the micro....but now that I think of it, I did not have to send any money for the disk and mailing. I realize that some of this is very debatable. I also did not think of the obvious problem of making it easy for some manufacturer to copy your hard work. I guess the only answer short of "giving away the programmed chip" would be to not take advantage of the free exposure of a QST article. See, it always comes back to that. That exposure has to be worth a lot, and I feel that I am helping to pay for it with my dues. QST is the most expensive of the monthlys, and I want something back for that. My closing thought is before someone would ever pay for an ad, they might try to cloak their ad as an article.....now that they see how it's done.

--

Charles Jack Hawley Jr.
Amateur Radio KE9UW (A.K.A. 'Chuck' in Ham Radio)
BMW K100RS, BMWMOA #224 (A.K.A. 'Jack' in Motorcycles)
hawley@aries.scs.uiuc.edu
Sr. Research Engineer Emeritus

Univ of Ill, Urbana-Champaign

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Harry_Chase@smtpgw.windata.com (Harry Chase)
Subject: [1353] re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9511148189.AA818971017@smtpgw.windata.com>

I have been following this controversy over the article in the latest QST, and I have one basic observation to make. I have no problems with someone doing a lot of work on a project and wanting to keep a few secrets that he can sell. Anyone in business does this to some degree; BUT -- the right way to handle this should have been to decide up front whether they were going to do a construction article (in which *all* of the necessary info is given) OR to do a "product announcement" or advertizement for a kit.

This particular project is one that can probably be made to work without a microcontroller anyway, depending on how "automatic" you want it to be, and I am glad someone put the effort to present as much info, as they did. I can learn at least something from most articles in technical magazines.

I will get upset, tho, if an article that is being billed as a construction article does not give reasonably complete info - i.e., enough so that someone with some experience in the area the article addresses can successfully complete the project himself. (I would not expect the writer to make it so detailed that someone with *no* experience can get through it; it would end up being a textbook!) --But of course, its a judgement call as to how experienced you expect the reader to be. Even with the source code given, there many who are not able to pop PROM's at home anyway. If they are interested in this project they would have to factor the time and cost of setting up a prom popper into the project cost.

I think the right answer here is to go ahead and publish your projects - but make it clear on the first line of the text whether there is any outside support required to get it completed. This should eliminate any misunderstandings before they start.

Speaking for myself, I prefer a project article that does not hold back any info; and if I was a publisher of a ham magazine I would put priority on those article submissions; BUT that is NOT to say I wouldnt ever publish the others as well.

Harry
WA1VVH

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: bmitchel@kodak.com (Brad Mitchell)
Subject: [1354] re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512141731.AA15029@iiatasun.cba.Kodak.COM>

To me the software is like the schematic..

How can I play, and modify it without the source code?

Regards, Brad WB8YGG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Thom <thom@li.net>
Subject: [1357] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951214132930.22599A-100000@linet01>

On Wed, 13 Dec 1995, Charles Cashion wrote:

> QRP'ers,
> The latest issue of QST came today. The item that pique'd my attention
> was an "automagic antenna tuner". I do not have an antenna tuner, so any
> antenna tuner would catch my attention. And it is a construction article!
> OH BOY! I love construction articles. Then I examine it more closely.
>
> The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.
> The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from the
> kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been here
> before? ...I think so.

Hi Gang,

Charles has said exactly as would have...What's going on here, anyway.

I thought I was being a bit over-sensative, but I'm glad that Charles agrees with me...If QST doesn't think it has enough ads, let 'em sell more instead of disguising them as articles.

Any other opinions?

73
de

Tom
WB2QDG

thom@li.net

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: bkmak@airmail.net (Bob Kmak)
Subject: [1358] re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <199512141833.MAA19520@server.iadfw.net>

Another alternative would be to publish a flow chart, or a pseudo-code listing of whatever the code does. That would have been better than keeping it secret, and probably could have been done in a way that would hide the tricks needed to squeeze it down to 512 bytes.

73,

Bob Kmak KC5RAS

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Pat Taber <ptaber@logiccraft.com>
Subject: [1360] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <199512141844.NAA41419@nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU>

I hope you'll forgive me if I don't quote the entire length of every posting about this....

It seems to me that what was published **is** a construction article. It tells how to construct a tuner using a particular part. The last time we went around about this, it was about a keyer and people seemed upset that someone would write an article that said "here's how you build a keyer using my part" while they would willingly have a third party write the same article saying "here's how you build a keyer using a Curtis chip." I guess I don't understand the difference other than a typical skin-flint ham response that everything should be given away free.

>>>==>PStJTT

calls, imagine the anger when we couldn't or wouldn't help, that is a road we did not want to travel.

I thank everyone for their kind words. Right now I feel this has been a positive experience.

Sencereely

de aa3av Gene from beautiful Mechanicsville Maryland, roadstop on the way to nowhere.

OBqrp: The tuner appears to work fine at qrp levels. The problems of rf getting into the micro just are not there at reduced power levels. The most extensive mod that might be required for qrpp levels would be an extra wrap of the transmission line on the sensor toroid.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: aa7qy@primenet.com (Roger Hightower)
Subject: [1366] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <199512141914.MAA06621@usr3.primenet.com>

This is a good thread....lots of opinions here.

I waited until my QST arrived so I could read the article. Seems fine to me. First paragraph, where it says 'programmed' microprocessors and complete kits are available. Aha! I don't have the gear to burn an eeprom, and ain't gonna get any for less than the cost of the pre-programmed unit. Same when I built the W9GR DSP...even though the source code was available, I couldn't pop my own chip.

Bait and switch? No way. If you really read para. 1 you should have had a clue.

This appears to be a heck of a unit developed by some very talented folk, and might make a nice mobile tuner...priced an SGC lately?

It would be nice if it didn't require a minimum 2 watts input...Chuck might have to use an amp for tuneup, then back to milliwatts, :-)

72, de Roger

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: H Smith <hbs@crl.com>

Subject: [1370] Re: Antenna Tuner

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951214112541.26273A-1000000@crl12.crl.com>

I vowed not to get into one of these non-qrp discussions but here I am.

To vector this discussion towards a QRP vein:

I would like to see more Home Brew QRP projects utilize inexpensive microprocessors. The KC1 keyer cleverly uses a micro. The QRP Plus depends on one. There has been some discussion concerning using a DSP chip with the R2 receiver. I even did my own DSP denoiser once.

Any body got and ideas for some projects using micros that we can all use?

Now concerning this Antenna Tuner discussion.

I do embedded software using the MC68HC11 and other micros.

Those of you who think that you can pick up a Motorola pink book on the MC68HC11, get a flow chart, schematics and write assembler code that will fit in 512 bytes, please send me your Resume. Or perhaps I should send you mine. This aint no easy task.

Furthermore, how you gonna test it? Does the average ham have a MC68HC11 target system and a debugger? Does the average ham have an EPROM programmer for the MC68HC11?

If I could get hold of the software and wanted to customize it, I might still need this stuff. (As a matter of fact I do have this stuff :-)

Write the program for the PC? Not a bad idea if you want to leave your PC on all the time. Or if you want to take your PC with you in the car :-)

So let someone else do the all the work and just sell me the chip for right now.

On the otherhand, as a programmer, I resent not having a copy of the program just like I would resent not having a copy of the schematic.

As far as some company stealing the software and doing their own thing, if it is a worthwhile product, you can rest assured that they will produce one, probably with out anyone elses help.

So I say, sell the chip with the program already burned in and make a program listing available for those of us who think we really understand that stuff anyway.

Back to QRP:

So lets dream up some QRP projects that use micros and get ourselves into the 21st century. Then We can give away all the software we want.

CUL,

Smitty, NA5K

Henry Smith (hbs@crl.com)

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: scicior@cp.mnet.uswest.com (Steve Ciciora)
Subject: [1371] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512142041.AA09837@sp5-316.nts.uswest.com>

<snip>

> Any body got and ideas for some projects using micros that we can all use?

>

<snip>

Back to QRP:

>

> So lets dream up some QRP projects that use micros and get ourselves into
> the 21st century. Then We can give away all the software we want.

>

> CUL,

>

> Smitty, NA5K

>

> Henry Smith (hbs@crl.com)

>

Well, not exactly re-producible, but I'm working on a 50 MHz frequency counter (32 bit) hooked up to a 6811 w/ lcd disp. I'd share my results but the counter chip is not easily available :-(. On the burner, I'm working on a VCO using a DDS and a PLL. Should greatly reduce (eliminate?) the massive spurs associated w/ DDSs. I also would like to use this combo for a function generator. I have dreams of using DSP filters for IF filters in future rigs, and like the idea of Embedded controllers controlling rigs.

Do _you_ have any good ideas? Let's hear them!

P.S. If it weren't for the griping over the auto antenna tuner, I would never have found out about it (don't get QST). Thanks! Good chance I'm going to order a pre-programmed chip! Even if the source code was free, have you _tried_ to buy a 68HC711E9 lately? Or any suffex? If you have a source, let me know!

Steven Ciciora

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "Mark A. Andrews" <ke4iof@fly.hiwaay.net>
Subject: [1378] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512142350.AA31382@fly.HiWAAAY.net>

> From: Charles Cashion <ccashion@spdmil.spd.dsccc.com>
> To: Multiple recipients of list <qrp-1@lehigh.edu>
> Subject: Antenna Tuner
> Date: Wed, 13 Dec 1995 22:25:06 EST

> QRP'ers,
> The latest issue of QST came today. The item that pique'd my
> attention
> was an "automagic antenna tuner". I do not have an antenna tuner, so
> any antenna tuner would catch my attention. And it is a construction
> article! OH BOY! I love construction articles. Then I examine it
> more closely.
>
> The bad news...The whole article is a commercial advertisement.
> The only way it can be built, is to order the micro-processor from
> the kind folk what designed it...umm...err...uhh?...Haven't we been
> here before? ...I think so.

Yes, we have. I was pretty angry after turning to the notes and realising you really can't build it yourself. You can be that I WON'T be ordering anything from that company.

Now, back to a better subject. I think I can program a microcontroller to do what the gentleman in the article did. Better yet, I think I can make it so the firmware is FIELD upgradeable with nothing more than a PC and a cable. I anyone interested?

I'll keep you informed....

(-----)
(Mark A. Andrews, KE4IOF)
(Symetric, Incorporated)
("Anything Digital..")
(-----)

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "Mark A. Andrews" <ke4iof@fly.hiwaay.net>
Subject: [1380] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512150023.AA07462@fly.HiWAAy.net>

> This is a good thread....lots of opinions here.
>
> I waited until my QST arrived so I could read the article. Seems
> fine to me. First paragraph, where it says 'programmed'
> microprocessors and complete kits are available. Aha! I don't have
> the gear to burn an eeprom, and ain't gonna get any for less than
> the cost of the pre-programmed unit. Same when I built the W9GR
> DSP...even though the source code was available, I couldn't pop my
> own chip.
>

The question is not whether to produce it in one form or another. The question is whether the source code should be provided to those of us who DO have the necessary equipment. If you don't have the programmer, then by all means, by a preprogrammed chip.

I don't deny that both of these men are talented and they deserve to be compensated in any way they see fit. However, I do have a problem with the pretense of the article. You can build it by the schematic, but it won't work if you don't have one key component, that can only be had from one source, the authors.

Now, on the Gene's assertion from a previous email. It would seem to me that if you published the source, the only people that would use it would probably be the ones that COULD use it. On the other hand, those same people probably don't need it.

(-----)
(Mark A. Andrews, KE4IOF)
(Symetric, Incorporated)
("Anything Digital..")
(-----)

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Mike White <mpw@chensys.com>
Subject: [1382] Re: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <9512150050.AA04639@puma.chensys.com>

At 06:52 PM 12/14/95 EST, you wrote:

>Now, back to a better subject. I think I can program a
>microcontroller to do what the gentleman in the article did. Better
>yet, I think I can make it so the firmware is FIELD upgradeable with
>nothing more than a PC and a cable. I anyone interested?

If you're going to make source available, also send it into QST for one of the 'tech notes.' You always see a little reverse engineering going on for a radio or some such - it would be nice to see a little software reverse engineering going on.

Might also make people realize that on component of this hobby is about sharing ideas...

(off soapbox...)

--

"Remember to tell your kids about the days when USENET was store and forward." -- Jim Thompson

Netscape - the Turbo C of the browser world.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: bobhigh@primenet.com (Bob Hightower)
Subject: [1383] RE: Antenna Tuner
Message-ID: <199512150125.SAA29960@usr4.primenet.com>

What IS the problem? There isn't anything I want to build, or have built, that I was able to do entirely from scratch...no matter whether it was in carpentry, electronics or anything else. If I didn't have the part on hand (and where would I have gotten it if I did?), I had to buy it, make it or scrounge it somewhere.

I defy anyone to tell me of something that they made out of nothing. I'm sure the tuner could be made by some other enterprising souls, but the authors are making it a lot easier for those of us who don't have the

parts/expertise on hand.

Please, give it a rest. Either build it yourself or buy it, but leave it be.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: John_Foote_at_HDN-BCSE@ccgate.ml.nec.com
Subject: [1350] Re: Antenna Tuner -Reply
Message-ID: <9511148189.AA818971645@mvlsmtg.ccgate.ml.nec.com>

They tell me a tremendous amount of digital signal processing hardware and several man-years of software coding went into packaging W1AW with the features you described.

All Newington has to do now is reverse-engineer it and publish it with a schematic and we'll have the best receiver design advance since "pass-band tuning."

72 de KR4GL
John Foote

By the way: My vertical antenna, combined with its extensive radial system can be made to produce some of the same effects while receiving non-W1AW signals.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: RHILT0@acxiom.com
Subject: [1329] Re: DATA SHEET: Coax Cables
Message-ID: <0d02afa0@acxiom.com>

Paul, NA5N, distributed a great coax chart...

>>RG-174 (and Mini-LAN) are miniature 50-ohm coax cables. (Neat for QRP).

Really??? RG-174 has the highest attenuation figure on the chart (3.3 dB per 100 feet at 10 MHz). I would have guessed that RG-58A (1.4 dB/100 feet at 10 MHz) would be a _much_ better QRP choice. Or are there more important factors than attenuation?

Bob ki5ez

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Steve Greene <sgreene@washsq.com>
Subject: [1340] Re: DATA SHEET: Coax Cables
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.3.91.951214102503.11637A-1000000@mercury.washsq.com>

On Thu, 14 Dec 1995 RHILT0@acxiom.com wrote:

> >>RG-174 (and Mini-LAN) are miniature 50-ohm coax cables. (Neat for
> QRP).
>
> Really??? RG-174 has the highest attenuation figure on the chart (3.3
> dB per 100 feet at 10 MHz). I would have guessed that RG-58A (1.4
> dB/100 feet at 10 MHz) would be a _much_ better QRP choice. Or are
> there more important factors than attenuation?

As always, it depends on how you're using it. If size and weight are important (e.g. backpacking) and run length will be short, RG-174 may be the only choice.

When I operate QRP satellite for Field Day, minimal attenuation is EVERYTHING and I use one of the new low-loss 9913-replacement coax cables.

72 & 73
Steve Greene
sgreene@access.digex.net

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: RHILT0@acxiom.com
Subject: [1347] Re: DATA SHEET: Coax Cables
Message-ID: <0d04e560@acxiom.com>

This reply from Paul is typical of the approximately 12 I received already this morning! Everyone had basically the same response: RG-174 is great when used correctly. My major mistake was caused by looking at things from only my point of view -- I don't usually work portable/backpack, don't have a need for a stealth antenna, and build only kits so I use what the designer recommends without considering why.

Ah, the joy of the list -- it's only 10 a.m. and already I've learned something useful.

7.3, ki5ez

>Bob,
>RG-174 is neat for QRP work, in small doses (like internal to the rig,
>or within the shack). There's often talk of how this "mini coax" is

>neat for feedlines, etc. The attenuation IS quite high, which is also
>why I included it to show its not the wonder stuff some people think.

>BTW, I built a phasing network out of some RG-174 for my 2-element
>phased array. First shot at it worked terrible. Wasn't getting the
>proper 90-degree phase. Finally squirted signals through it, and
>looked at both ends on a dual trace oscscope and discovered the
>velocity factor was MUCH worse than shown. It was closer to nearly
>50%! Cut the RG-174 based on this value and the phase lines worked
>great. So we need to be skeptical of data sheets, or at least measure
>if we can when a parameter is particularly important to us.

>Paul NA5N

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (chuck adams)
Subject: [1330] Re: December QRPP
Message-ID: <199512141355.NAA19038@chuck.dallas.sgi.com>

Gang,

Since Doug can't do it, someone post the info on the St Louis Tuner.
That way we'll all be on equal footing to get the first 200 and
probably the only 200 to be made.

dit dit

--

Chuck Adams (K5FO CP-60) adams@sgi.com
Box 181150, Dallas, TX 75218-8150

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Allen Jones <ajones@adsnet.com>
Subject: [1372] Re: December QRPP
Message-ID: <199512142102.PAA19060@alice.adsnet.com>

<SNIP>

> December
>issue of QRPP was sent to the printer on Oct. 31.

<SNIP>

> There is information on page 66 on how
>to order a St. Louis Tuner and also an announcement that there are 50 more
>Cascades available. Please don't email me and ask for information. As editor

>I think that I must not give that information out on the net until the
>subscribers have had a chance to get the info. Of course I have no control
>if someone else posts the information when they get their copy. 72,Doug

I do hope someone *DOES* post this info to the list. From what I have seen,
mail delivery of QRPP varies by destination by several days to a couple
weeks putting some at a disadvantage when kit quantities are limited.
Because of Doug's position as editor I can understand his reluctance to
divulge info as it would look like favoritism toward members of QRP-L.

72/3 de Allen, K9DZE

=====
Allen Jones K9DZE ajones@adsnet.com
Michigan City, Indiana EN61nq
ARCI G-QRP NorCal QRP-L #112
=====

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: David Speegle <dspeegle@dialin.ind.net>
Subject: [1321] Re: FOUR DAYS IN MAY (c) -- A REMINDER
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951214050044.1973A-100000@dialin.ind.net>

When is the four days in may? I know it sounds stupid, but I have never
attended the qrp forums at Dayton. In fact I have been to Dayton only
twice. Could you give me dates of the forums and the hamvention? Sounds
interesting. Signed: Stupid! Dave NE9F

=====
| David Speegle Email Alias: David.Speegle@dialin.ind.net
|
|
| 311 S West St.
|
| Argos, IN 46511
| Phone: 219.546.3848 FAX:
=====

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Clark Savage Turner WA3JPG <turner@safety.ICS.UCI.EDU>
Subject: [1316] Re: Hum in supply/spkr
Message-ID: <23774.818919799@safety.ics.uci.edu>

I wrote:

> >A simple problem, I suspect. I have the Ten Tec power supply with
> >speaker built in. When I power up the supply, the speaker gives an
> >audible hum. The hum is not through the audio amp in the rig, it
> >seems to originate in the line to the speaker. It increases when
> >the rig is on and when I transmit (current draw).

Lee, WA3FIY wrote back:

> I'll bet your hum has something to do with a ground loop. Some of
> the operating current is passing through the speaker ground. See if
> there is a ground connection to the speaker in the power supply. If
> so, temporarily disconnect it and see if the hum goes away. If it
> does, problem solved, if not, looks like you will have to check
> further.

I got good advice from many on this group, and thanks to all, but
Lee's advice led to the solution! I disconnected a ground wire to
the speaker at the ground lead to the speaker wire. No hum at
anytime now. Just not the sort of thing I would have thought of!

Clark
WA3JPG

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "Norman E. Fink" <norm@uu1238.flowerslabs.com>
Subject: [1338] Re: Mascot
Message-ID: <9512141508.AA06780@flowerslabs.com>

On Thu, 14 Dec 1995 09:51:44 EST, Lee, W5TEH, wrote:

>Gang,

>Hank, K8DD, and others have mentioned wanting
>to see pictures of the Snipe, proposed mascot
>of our group.

>Here is a picture of the Fox (somewhat different
>from the ASCII pictures recently posted here) which
>I have managed to hear twice this season but unable

>to work.....

>Now here is a picture of the Snipe which I have
>actually caught once or twice in my younger

>days.....

>Notice the uncanny resemblance! It would make a
>perfect logo for this gang on our ballcaps,
>sweatshirts, stationery, etc. For those
>of you unable to decode the above pictures due
>to lack of software, etc. you may e-mail me
>direct for 8 x 10 color glossys, for a modest
>price.

What a coincidence! I just bought a package of t-shirts at Walmart with those same pictures on them!

Norm, K2NF

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: LVE1@inel.gov (Larry East)
Subject: [1355] Re: NorCal 40A Question
Message-ID: <9512141805.AA00991@garnet.inel.gov>

Have had about a zillion replies saying that "full bore" for the NorCal 40A audio gain pot is about normal, so don't need any more conformation.

Thanks one and all -- now I know that mine is "normal" (in that respect, at least...).

72, Larry.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: prvalko <prvalko@Oakland.edu>
Subject: [1326] Re: QRP MASCOT
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.91.951214081529.17174A-100000@saturn.acs.oakland.edu>

On Thu, 14 Dec 1995, Duane Anderson wrote:

> I think we should adopt the Mongoose as the mascot.

Oh fer cryin' out loud...

Do you guys have to rely on ME for everything?

I stayed away from THIS debate, and let me say, this topic is right up there with Q-Dope, Switching Power Supplies, and Dayton WX. I was going to say, "we don't neeeeed no steeeeeeeeenkin' mascot!" BUT as the topic is not mercifully going away, I only have one word to say...

F O X

Now, get over it.

73! =paul= wb8zjl

I have spoken

We return the list back to its original intent, whatever that is. ;-)

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995

From: prvalko <prvalko@Oakland.edu>

Subject: [1327] Re: QRP MASCOT

Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.91.951214082655.17174B-100000@saturn.acs.oakland.edu>

On Thu, 14 Dec 1995, prvalko wrote:

>

> I stayed away from THIS debate, and let me say, this topic is right up
> there with Q-Dope, Switching Power Supplies, and Dayton WX. I was going
> to say, "we don't neeeeed no steeeeeeeeenkin' mascot!" BUT as the topic
> is not mercifully going away, I only have one word to say...

>

> F O X

Oh my gosh. That message was so good, *I* have to respond to my own post!

The fox is the only decent choice for QRP-Lers(tm). The Fox is witty, quick, clean (who the heck recommended, "Cockroach?!?"), and a part of QRP Culture. I am a genius.

73! =paul= wb8zjl

They called me arrogant, but I know better.

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
Subject: QST Aug '95: Bring 'Em Back Alive!; QRP freqs

On 12/12/95 at 07:37 EST, Hank Kohl K8DD <k8dd@sun.tir.com> wrote:

> The January QST... is also, from the best of my memory, the first time that
> the ARRL has put QRP into "The Considerate Operator's Frequency Guide"...

Back in July, I wrote to Mark Wilson about this with your unsuspecting backing. Although I would like to think that a simple email to someone at ARRL would have this effect, it is possible that enough of us voiced our opinion and more likely that someone on QST staff (perhaps among us) actually caused it to happen.

Mr. Wilson did write me a prompt, considered reply from which I conclude that coverage of special interests in QST, in terms of feature articles, is determined more by the quality of submissions they receive than from an editorial bias as some might assume.

I do not take this kind of responsiveness for granted. It is rare indeed.

BTW, the improvements in January's QST are, IMHO, outstanding.

----- Forward -----
Subject: QST Aug '95: Bring 'Em Back Alive!; QRP freqs
From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Pat Taber <ptaber@logicraft.com>
Subject: [1359] Re: random wire ant.
Message-ID: <199512141833.NAA85774@nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU>

>Is there an optimum length for a random wire???

It wouldn't be random then, would it? Or is this one of those "meta" questions? "What is the *most* random length?"

>>>==>PStJTT

Patrick Taber	Email: ptaber@logicraft.com
Principal Software Engineer	Phone: (603) 880-0300
Logicraft Information Services	Fax: (603) 880-7229
22 Cotton Road	QRP-L: 215
Nashua N.H. 03063	Also known as: KC1TD

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM (Pete Rossi)
Subject: [1362] Re: random wire ant.
Message-ID: <9512141857.AA12895@gvlf6-a>

->

->>Is there an optimum length for a random wire???

->

->It wouldn't be random then, would it? Or is this one of those "meta"
->questions? "What is the *most* random length?"

I would say that a "random" length is one that is not resonant on any particular chosen frequency. That implies you just string a wire up in the trees (or whatever) and don't even measure it. That would be sort of random.

But usually when you put up a wire, it is nice to make it resonant *somewhere* that you know, which would involve measuring out a known length. Then it is not truly "random" anymore.

Maybe what he was really asking was "optimum length of a longwire antenna".

The rule of thumb... 1/2 wave on the lowest frequency usually works..

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA
rossi@vfl.paramax.com
Loral Defense Systems-Eagan (formerly Unisys Government Systems Group)
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

From qrp-1@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: "rohre" <rohre@arlut.utexas.edu>
Subject: [1373] RE: random wire ant.
Message-ID: <n1393168120.30355@msmailgw1.arlut.utexas.edu>

Time for some basics---This is a good questions about one of my pet areas.

Whether you are QRP or not does not affect your antenna length. (I think the question implies issues of managing a "portable" random wire, for afield use, motel room use, etc.)

Let us look at what John Kraus, W8JK, the well known antenna inventor, and handbook author says about what makes an antenna radiate. It is the discontinuity, such as a change of direction in a folded dipole, or the end of the wire on a dipole, that makes the wave launch from the wire to space. It is most easily launched if the change of direction of the conductor happens to be at the a point where the wire represents a resonant length for the frequency in use. Thus we usually see resonant antennas in use of $1/4$ wave, $1/2$ wave or multiples. The main thing, with apologies to Dr. Kraus for my all too casual description of his explanation, is that more efficient antenna performance happens with resonant structures, and the largest area of antenna to capture the received wave.

Now, there really are NO RANDOM LENGTH WIRES. In the sense, that if the wire has SOME length, there will be some frequency where that wire is resonant. In ham use, it just might not be one of use to us! Thus, anything too short to resonate at the frequency in use is less efficient as an antenna than a resonant antenna that it most closely resembles. A random horizontal wire would probably resonate above or below the band you are on, and be compared to a dipole resonant on that band.

In the spirit of having more antenna area to capture signals, it is good, if you cannot put up a balanced dipole, to still make your random wire about as long as a dipole or a quarter wave vertical at least, and then provide the needed impedance matching transformation to the transceiver (usual) 50 ohm output. However, any matching network will have its own losses, thus we get back to this efficient transfer of the energy ultimately to space. If we provide more wire than a single half wave, and in fact at optimum increments, we can start to gain over a dipole in certain directions and angles of take off.

If you plan to operate a number of bands, but can have only one wire, make it long enough for the lowest frequency band you use, and the tuner can match it on the higher bands. With some tuners, and some bands, you might have trouble matching but a slight lengthening should move any impedance "bump" around to where the tuner can match the wire to the rig. Be alert to issues that some tuners are better than others when it comes to non-resonant antenna lengths. Just because the commercial model has a single wire connection does not mean it will match even the proverbial wet kite string!

I have used "random" wires up to 400 feet long, and as short as $1/4$ wave.

They are so dependent on the counterpoise or "ground" character, and your matching device, that I found them to give me more RF in the shack than in space, and not having, at the time, access or knowledge about optimum matching devices, I abandoned them for other antenna solutions. I did not have a good RF ground or counterpoise in either location and that was

part of the problem. And remember, a ground rod does little to nothing in terms of resonant performance, except where the rod is resonant.

I think if you are going to optimize your results, start with at least a quarter wave in the air, and a quarter wave counterpoise laid out on the ground, (or however you can arrange it) for the band in use. (Notice that looks a lot like a dipole?) Add more until you get to the maximum distance you can keep a wire supported. The counterpoise makes you less dependent on the quality of earth under your antenna.

Somewhere between those lengths, you will decide what is working well, and convenient to set up, if for a portable use. The performance will vary from location to location depending on ground conductivity at RF. That is why I have found in my rocky area that an elevated vertical with radials or a dipole works better for me, while my friends in North Texas enjoy good luck with various long wires with good soil conductivity under them.

For bands of 20 and up, I think more use should be made of wires with gain, like the half square antenna, which would still be easy to erect in the field, with the use of fishing weights to keep the vertical quarter wave parts hanging taut. Its half wave horizontal top wire would be about the same as managing a dipole, or other wire, in terms of needed supports. The total wire would be like a "random" wire antenna, but would help boost your QRP signal on the band for which it is cut.

To lower your electric received noise level, using about the amount of wire a long "random" antenna might use, you could put up a horizontal full wave loop, delta, or a sloping version of these. There are ways to make these cover multi-bands.

So there are a lot of options on how to use a length of wire.
Good Luck on yours!

72, Stuart K5KVH
rohre@arlut.utexas.edu

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Fri Dec 15 03:13:00 1995
From: Clark Savage Turner WA3JPG <turner@safety.ICS.UCI.EDU>
Subject: [1377] Re: tuner source code
Message-ID: <5586.818984234@safety.ics.uci.edu>

> Looks like if the guys that designed the tuner would
> publish the source code, then everybody would be happy.

Not so. The authors already stated that they would not give away that part and why. Some of us can respect that and leave it at that, even though we may like to see it otherwise.

Look, the tuner can be built without the chip they sell. They offer the flowchart. It is not hard to go from there if you really want to do it.

We all have the option of building our own software for the thing. I say, get to work on the new improved version of the software. If you consider it very important, sit down and develop the software and give the sourcecode away for free.

Yes, many of us would appreciate your efforts to produce software and give away the source. I am not interested in pressuring the authors, though. They have worked long and hard at this and I respect their decision about its disposition.

Clark
WA3JPG